

United States Department of Agriculture

SERVICE AND REGULATORY ANNOUNCEMENTS

BUREAU OF CHEMISTRY

SUPPLEMENT

N. J. 14351-14400

[Approved by the Secretary of Agriculture, Washington, D. C., October 23, 1926]

NOTICES OF JUDGMENT UNDER THE FOOD AND DRUGS ACT

[Given pursuant to section 4 of the food and drugs act]

14351. Adulteration and misbranding of white flour middlings. U. S. v. New Richmond Roller Mills Co. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$100 and costs. (F. & D. No. 19663. I. S. Nos. 21867-v, 21868-v, 21869-v, 21870-v, 21876-v.)

On September 1, 1925, the United States attorney for the Western District of Wisconsin, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district an information against the New Richmond Roller Mills Co., a corporation, New Richmond, Wis., alleging shipment by said company in violation of the food and drugs act, in various consignments from the State of Wisconsin, on or about August 22, September 2, 10, and 11, 1924, respectively, into the State of Ohio, and on or about August 30, 1924, into the State of Indiana, of quantities of white flour middlings which were adulterated and misbranded. The article was labeled in part: "Doughboy * * * New Richmond Roller Mills Co. New Richmond, Wisconsin. 100 Lbs. Fancy White Flour Middlings"

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the information for the reason that a substance, to wit, ground screenings, had been mixed and packed therewith so as to reduce and lower and injuriously affect its quality and strength and had been substituted in part for fancy white flour middlings, which the said article purported to be.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the statement, to wit, "Fancy White Flour Middlings," borne on the labels, was false and misleading, in that the said statement represented that the article consisted wholly of fancy white flour middlings, and for the further reason that it was labeled as aforesaid so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser into the belief that it consisted wholly of fancy white flour middlings, whereas it did not but did consist in part of ground screenings, which were undeclared upon the label.

On March 6, 1926, a plea of guilty to the information was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of \$100 and costs.

W. M. JARDINE, *Secretary of Agriculture.*

14352. Misbranding of cottonseed meal and cake. U. S. v. 185 Sacks of Cottonseed Meal and 200 Sacks of Cottonseed Cake. Consent decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product released under bond. (F. & D. No. 21021. I. S. Nos. 456-x, 457-x. S. No. W-1956.)

On April 21, 1926, the United States attorney for the District of Colorado, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 185 sacks of cottonseed meal and 200 sacks of cottonseed cake,